## STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representatives, David A. Divine and Patrick Reed, on June 12, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's representatives pointed out that the March 27, 2007 Office Action could not properly have been made final, since it set forth new grounds of rejection of claim 23. However, claim 23 had not been substantively amended in the previous response (claim 23 was merely rewritten in independent form). The Examiner agreed that the March 27, 2007 Office Action should not have been made final. Accordingly, the next response (i.e., this response) should be entered without the need to file a Request for Continued Examination.

Also during the interview, several amendments to existing claims were discussed. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to agree that, subject to an updated search, independent claims 1, 22, and 23 would be allowable if amended as discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant herein amends claims 1, 22, and 23 in the manner discussed in the interview. Claims 1-23 are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed during the interview.

7 LEE & HAYES, PLLC RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION U.S. PATENT APPLICATION No. 10/663,532

BE1-0028US